

REMARKS

Claim Status:

Claims 1 to 4 and 14 are rejected as being anticipated by Simmons.

Claims 1 and 11 are rejected as being anticipated by Lonon.

Claims 1,5,6, 14 and 15 are rejected as being obvious over Hawkins in view of Hung.

Claims 7 to 9 and 12 are rejected as being obvious over Simmons in view of Camarota.

Claim 10 is rejected as being obvious over Simmons in view of Brownell.

Claim 13 is rejected as being obvious over Simmons in view of Levine.

Claims 16 and 17 are rejected as being obvious over Simmons in view of Levine and Erickson.

Claims 18 is rejected as being obvious over Simmons in view of Levine, Erickson and Bogard.

Section 112 Rejections to claim 5 and 6:

Claim 5 was rejected as being obvious

Claim 5 has been cancelled.

Claim 6 was rejected as being indefinite.

Claim 6 has been cancelled.

“Jacks” vs. “Jack Stands”:

The Applicant submits that the Examiner incorrectly equates “jacks” and “jack stands” in setting for the present anticipation and obviousness rejections, as follows:

A “jack” is a device used to lift a vehicle. Simmons, Lonon, Hung and Levine are all examples of vehicle “jacks”.

A “jack stand” is a device used to support a vehicle after it has already been lifted up by a jack. Hawkins is an example of a “jack stand”.

“Jacks” and “jack stands” are different device that are used together, as follows.

First, a mechanic lifts a vehicle off the ground with a jack. Then, the mechanic positions a jack stand under the vehicle to support the vehicle, such that the jack can be removed. As can be seen in the Simmons, Lonon, Hung and Levine systems, vehicle jacks are typically small hydraulic systems that are inserted under the vehicle to raise it from the ground. As can be seen in the Hawkins system, a jack stand is a stationary mechanical support with a large wide base. Having such a large supporting base makes a jack stand much more resistant to tipping over than a jack. Thus, it is only safe for a mechanic to work under a vehicle when the vehicle is supported on a jack stand, not just on a jack.

Amendment to Claim 1:

To secure the timely issuance of a patent, and without concurring in the Examiner's rejections in any way, claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations previously set forth in claims 5 and 6. Claims 5 and 6 are now cancelled.

The present amendment to claim 1 thus overcomes the anticipation in view of Simmons '826 and London '407.

As presently amended, claim 1 now sets forth:

“A vehicle jack stand, comprising:
a generally pyramidal shaped support body;
a vertically moveable post received within the support body; and
a light source mounted in the support body *co-planar with one of the sides of the generally pyramidal shaped support body.*”[emphasis added]

First, as pointed out above, the presently claimed invention is a “jack *stand*”, not a “jack”.

Second, as claimed, the present jack stand has a support body 20 that is *generally pyramidal*. This feature of the invention is clearly shown in figs. 1 and 2.

Third, as also claimed, the present jack stand has a light source that is mounted co-planar with one of the sides of the support body. This feature of the invention is shown most clearly in Fig. 3.

Jack stands support bodies are generally pyramidal in shape (e.g.: see Hawkins)

In accordance with the present invention, a light source is mounted *co-planar with one of the sides* of the support body. This feature of the invention is particularly advantageous as follows. As shown in Fig. 3, and as stated in para. [0017] of the specification, the center beam B of light emitted by light 30 (which is perpendicular to side 21) is directed at an upward angle ALPHA from the horizontal. As a result, the light from the light source is directed at an optimal angle to a vehicle sitting on top of the jack stand.

Specifically, the presently claimed configuration uses the natural angle of side (21) of the jack stand to be the angle at which lighting is provided to the underside of a vehicle. This ensures that the center of the light beam is neither directed substantially straight vertically upwards or substantially straight horizontally outwards, which would be disadvantageous, as follows.

Directing light straight upwards would only offer illumination to a limited area of the vehicle sitting directly on top of the jack stand. Conversely, directing light straight outwards from the jack stand would not sufficiently illuminate the underside of the vehicle.

A further advantage of positioning the present light source in the support body *co-planar with one of the sides* of the support body is that the light source is out of the way of an operator's hands and tools. In other words, the light source is not a bulky attachment hanging onto the side of the jack stand. Furthermore, mounting the light source *co-planar with one of the sides* of the support body places the light source in a location where it does not interfere with the movement of the vertical post (22).

Lastly, as can be seen, mounting the light source *co-planar with one of the sides* of the support body permits the light source to be mounted at a location away from the load bearing "legs" (i.e.: corners) of the jack stand. Thus, the presence of the light source away from the corners of the jack stand does not weaken the strength of the jack stand.

In view of the forgoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim 16:

Claim 16 was rejected as being obvious over Simmons in view of Levine and Erickson.

As stated above, the presently claimed invention relates to “jack *stands*”, not “jacks”.

In contrast, each of Simmons, Levine and Erickson are examples of “jacks”, not “jack *stands*”.

Secondly, claim 16 specifically sets forth a *plurality* of *illuminated* jack stands.

In contrast, neither Simmons, Levine nor Erickson set forth a method of using a *plurality* of jack stands, let alone a *plurality* of *illuminated* jack stands. The presently claimed invention is advantageous in that it is able to provide illumination under a vehicle, with the illumination being provided from four corners of the vehicle, and with the mechanic able to move around freely without any power cords in his way. (See Fig. 5 and paras. [0024] and [0025] of the specification.)

In view of the forgoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the present obviousness rejections is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

For the reasons presented above, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the present application, he is invited to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Bret Hartmann

Date: _____

8-20-04

By: _____

Michael B. Hartmann

Michael Bret Hartmann
448 Victory Ave.,
So. San Francisco, Ca. 94080